



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,337	05/31/2000	Ilan Shamir	40116.198901	2396
23859	7590	10/27/2003	EXAMINER	
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C. SUITE 1000 999 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915			NGUYEN, QUANG N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/583,337

Applicant(s)

SHAMIR ET AL.

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/31/2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2, 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2141

Detail Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Election Response filed on 09/16/2003. Applicant's election of group I (claims 1-13) in Paper No. 6, is acknowledged. Claims 14-25 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2141

3. Claims 1-2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Choung et al. (US 6,487,195), herein after referred as Choung.

4. As to claim 1, Choung teaches a method and a web site server provides collaborative web page navigation feature for a group of user terminals, comprising:

associating a browser companion with each of multiple users' respective browsers (Choung, C3: L11-17, C6: L53-67 and C7: L1-7);

generating multiple categories of information related to the object (new web pages) accessed via a first user's browser (Choung, C7: L12-15); and

displaying the related information to (1) the first user and (2) the other of the multiple users via their respective browsers or associated browser companions (Choung, C7: L33-42).

5. As to claim 2, Choung teaches the method of claim 1, in which the multiple categories of information comprise a category selected from the group of consisting of one or more: (a) links (i.e., new web pages containing URLs/links) by which the user can access via the browser or browser companion other information with the network related to the object; (b) communities; and (c) products.

6. Claims 7-8 are corresponding system claims of claims 1-2; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2141

7. Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scherpbier et al. (US 5,944,791), herein after referred as Scherpbier.

8. As to claim 1, Scherpbier teaches a method and system for collaborative web browser comprising:

associating a browser companion (pilot applet 22 or passenger applet 28) with each of multiple users' respective browsers (pilot browser 20 or passenger browser 26);

generating multiple categories of information related to the object (new web pages) accessed via a first user's browser, i.e., pilot browser (Scherpbier, C5: L36-54);
and

displaying the related information to (1) the first user and (2) the other of the multiple users via their respective browsers or associated browser companions (Scherpbier, Fig. 1 and corresponding text, C2:L57 – C3:L18, C5: L21-54 and C6: L16-20).

9. As to claim 2, Scherpbier teaches the method of claim 1, in which the multiple categories of information comprise a category selected from the group of consisting of one or more: (a) links (i.e., new web pages containing URLs/links) by which the user can access via the browser or browser companion other information with the network related to the object; (b) communities; and (c) products (Scherpbier, C5: L36-42).

Art Unit: 2141

10. As to claims 3-5, Scherpbier teaches a method of claim 1 comprising the flight management steps shown in Fig. 6 can be instigated by an HTML request from the pilot computer 18 (i.e., the first user) to the control module 16 (of the server to manage the collaborative browsing session) to undertake the various flight management tasks such as limit number of passengers on flight (i.e., limit number of participants in the collaborative session), eject passengers (i.e., kick users), promote passenger to co-pilot (i.e., designate users as super users who have rights to perform some special functions), etc... (Scherpbier, Fig. 6 and C7: L22-58). Scherpbier also teaches an applet adapted to present information pertaining to the current flight, i.e., the collaborative browsing session (Scherpbier, Fig. 4 and corresponding text, C5: L21-30).

11. Claims 7-9 are corresponding system claim of claims 1-3; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

12. As to claims 10 and 12, Scherpbier teaches a system for collaborative web browser comprising:

a computer (pilot computer 18 or passenger computer 24 of Fig. 1), associated with at least one of the users and having a first browser (pilot browser 20 or passenger browser 26 of Fig. 1, i.e., browser/web page display 62 of Fig. 4) for viewing the World Wide Web (Scherpbier, Figs. 1, 4 and corresponding text);

a second browser (pilot applet 22 or passenger applet 28 of Fig. 1, i.e., applet/flight information display 64 of Fig. 4), coupled to the computer and adapted to

Art Unit: 2141

allow users to post information to a web page being viewed by a particular user and communicate with a computer network comprising at least one server (web server site 12) that supports the second browser, whereby the second browser is adapted to provide the server with tracking information concerning the object being displayed by the first browser, i.e., information pertaining to the (flight) collaborative browsing session (Scherpbier, C5: L21-30); and

wherein the server, upon receipt of the tracking information (the requested URL), generates a list of related information (retrieves the web page) for delivery to the first or second browser for display to the user (Scherpbier, C2:L57 – C3:L18, C6: L15-19).

13. As to claim 13, Scherpbier teaches a browser companion for use in accessing the Web or another computer network, the browser companion comprising:

a display (pilot display 18a or passenger display 24a) for showing multiple categories of information related to an object (a Web page) accessed by a user (pilot or passenger) of the browser companion (Scherpbier, Fig. 1 and corresponding text);

a first applet (pilot applet 22 or passenger applet 28) for interfacing with a first server ("control computer" 12) in order to retrieve the categories of related information (a Web page), wherein the first applet provides the first server with updates concerning the user's present location or actions (Scherpbier, Fig. 1 and corresponding text);

a second applet (pilot browser 20 or passenger browser 26) for providing to a second server (web sites 14a and 14b) in order to allow the user to browse the Web

Art Unit: 2141

collaboratively with other users (Scherpbier, Fig. 1 and corresponding text, C3: L40-67 and C4: L1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. **Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherpbier, in view of Nagar et al. (US 6,604,143), herein after referred as Nagar.**

16. As to claim 6, Scherpbier teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the generating step comprises:

forwarding to a Web server a descriptor of the object (a URL/link or a web page address) or action taken by the user to access the object (Scherpbier, C5: L36-42);

However, Scherpbier does not explicitly teach the step of comparing the descriptor with a database storing (a) a plurality of different descriptors and (b) the information reacted to each such descriptor.

Art Unit: 2141

In the related art, Nagar teaches a system and method for filtering of information (request and response) transmitted between a client process and a server process wherein the server receives a URL request and compares that URL against filter rules (that include plurality of URLs, i.e., database storing a plurality of different descriptors of the object) previously defined to the system (Nagar, C5:L62 – C6:L11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Scherpbier and Nagar to include the step of comparing the descriptor with a database storing a plurality of different descriptors because it would allow the system to filter the requests to fix incorrect URLs (errors from user's typing) by presenting a list of "best matched" URLs; to access the cached information if any based on the matched URL; and to modify the content and characteristics of the information to correspond with the client or server process environment.

17. Claim 11 is a corresponding claim of claim 6; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

18. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

Art Unit: 2141

19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Quang N. Nguyen

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Le Hien Luu', with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER